

University of Dayton
eCommons

[All Committee Minutes](#)

[Academic Senate Committees](#)

11-26-2012

Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2012-11-26

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins

Recommended Citation

University of Dayton. Academic Policies Committee, "Academic Policies Committee Minutes of the Academic Senate 2012-11-26" (2012). *All Committee Minutes*. 188.
https://ecommons.udayton.edu/senate_cmte_mins/188

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate Committees at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact fprice1@udayton.edu, mschlangen1@udayton.edu.

Minutes of the Academic Policies Committee of the Academic Senate
November 26 2012
KU 207

Present: Paul Benson, Deb Bickford, Jim Dunne, Vinod Jain, Laura Leming, Kurt Mosser, Leno Pedrotti, Paul Vanderburgh

Absent: Paul Bobrowski, Sarah Kerns, Karen Swisher, Anthony Whaley, John White

Minutes: Minutes of the October 29, 2012 meeting of the Academic Policies Committee were approved with minor corrections.

Announcements: There will be no more meetings of the APC in the Fall 2012 term. Spring APC meetings will be held from 2-2:50 pm on selected Fridays. The dates tentatively selected for APC meeting in the spring are listed below.

Friday, January 18, 2-2:50 pm

Friday, January 25, 2-2:50 pm

Friday, February 8, 2-2:50 pm

Friday, February 15, 2-2:50 pm

Friday, February 22, 2-2:50 pm

Friday, March 8, 2-2:50 pm

Friday, March 22, 2-2:50 pm

Friday, April 5, 2-2:50 pm

Friday, April 12, 2-2:50 pm

Old Business:

CAPCC Status Report

Leno Pedrotti reported that the CAPCC approved the first set of CAP courses (the Humanities Commons courses) on 11/22/2012. These course proposals were submitted using a paper submission. The online course proposal submission system is in final testing.

Status of the Competency Requirements under the Common Academic Program (CAP)

Leno Pedrotti reported that he had communicated with the chairs of the Departments of Mathematics, English, and Communications and a representative, Heidi Gauder, of the University Libraries regarding the possible discontinuation of the Competency Program requirements. These chairs voiced no objection to exploring the discontinuation of these requirements. Heidi Gauder indicated that faculty and staff members of the University Library had no strong objections to the discontinuation of the Competency Program requirements but would very much like to ensure that the information literacy programs offered by the Library, partly in fulfillment of the Competency Program requirements, be continued if the Competency Program requirements were to be discontinued. Members of the APC noted that it was likely that the information literacy programs offered by the faculty and staff of the University Library would continue if the Competency Program requirements were to be discontinued since these programs are integrated into existing courses. Leno Pedrotti noted that Heidi Gauder indicated a concern that, without some sort of formal requirement that the information literacy programs be offered by the library, these programs might eventually be discontinued. It was agreed that the role of the programs in information literacy offered by the faculty and staff of the University Libraries is an important issue to be mindful of as the prospect of discontinuing the Competency Program is further explored. Leno Pedrotti indicated that he would think about forming a proposal to discontinue the Competency Program over the winter break and that this topic would be an important one for the APC in Spring 2013.

Revision of DOC 12-08: Departmental Proposal Process

Leno Pedrotti reported that after reviewing DOC 94-10 "Initiation, Suspension, Reactivation and Discontinuation of Undergraduate Academic Degree Programs", DOC 12-05 "Undergraduate Degree Program Proposal Process: Amendment to Senate Document 94-10", and DOC 12-08 "Department Proposal Process" that, rather than amending DOC 12-08 to clarify the role of the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate in the approval process flow for proposed changes to the structure of an academic department, he recommends that a new senate policy be developed that would replace the three documents listed above and incorporate the proposed amendments to DOC 12-08. He stated that creating a single policy

document to govern the initiation, suspension, discontinuation, etc.. of both academic degree programs and academic departments would simplify the proposal process since changes in academic department structure is often linked to changes in academic degree programs. Further, he noted that there were some inconsistencies in the flow of the proposal approval processes listed in the three existing documents. Leno Pedrotti offered to develop, over the winter break, a new policy document to govern changes to both academic degree programs and academic departments. Members of the APC agreed that this was a good way to proceed.

Section 4.8 of the CAPCC Procedures Manual

Section 4.8 “Time Limitations of Proposals” was not approved by the APC when it approved the other sections of the CAPCC procedures. Leno Pedrotti solicited questions or suggestions regarding this section for transmittal to the CAPCC. Suggestions and questions (some of which first were voiced at the October 15 APC meeting) included the following.

- The nature of the CAP course renewal process is not clearly elucidated: It is not clear what sort of review is to be done at the department level before requesting renewal. Further, section 4.8 does not state under which circumstances (if any) a request for renewal might be denied. The CAPCC process and criteria to be used to approve or deny a renewal request is not clearly stated.
- Section 4.8 states that courses are approved for a period of three years from the date of CAPCC approval. Is this the appropriate starting time for the three year period?
- The meaning of “other similar information” in the statement in Section 4.8 that reads “The faculty and department will be asked to submit a sample syllabus for the course or other similar information for CAPCC approval.” should be clarified.
- Should the time period for approval be extended to 4 or 5 years?
- Should a form be developed for departments to use when requesting renewal?

Leno Pedrotti indicated that he would pass these suggestions and questions on to the CAPCC.

New Business: None

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 am.

Submitted by Leno Pedrotti